BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION WASHINGTON, D.C.

ORIGINAL,

Joint Application of

AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.

and

LINEA AEREA NACIONAL CHILE,

S.A. (LAN CHILE)

under 49 U.S.C. §§ 41308 and 41309 for approval of and antitrust immunity for

alliance agreement

OST-97-3285 - 30

98 APR -3 PH 4: 18

OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION OF AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC. TO STRIKE THE REPLY OF AEROVIAS DE MEXICO, S.A. DE C.V.

Communications with respect to this document should be sent to:

Lic. Alfonso Pasquel B. Lic. Jose Rafael Robles D. Mr. Jared Harckham

Aerovias de Mexico, S.A. de C.V.

Paseo de la **Reforma** No. 445, 5th Floor

C.P. 06500

Mexico, D.F., Mexico 01 1-525-133-4000

Irwin P. Altschuler, Esq. Donald S. Stein, Esq.

Stephanie E. Silverman, Senior Advisor

John W. Vardaman, III, Esq.

MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS 1501 M Street, N.W., Suite 700 Washington, DC 20005-1702

(202) 463-4300

William C. Evans, Esq. John R. Mietus, Jr., Esq.

VERNER, LIIPFERT, BERNHARD,

MCPHERSON AND HAND

901 15th Street, N.W.

Suite 700

Washington, DC 20005

(202) 371-6000

April 3, 1998

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION WASHINGTON, D.C.

Joint Application of

AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.

and

OST-97-3285

LINEA AEREA NACIONAL CHILE, S.A. (LAN CHILE)

under 49 U.S.C. §§ 41308 and 41309 for approval of and antitrust immunity for alliance agreement

OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION OF AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC. TO STRIKE THE REPLY OF AEROVIAS DE MEXICO, S.A. DE C.V.

Aerovias de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. ("Aeromexico") hereby responds to the March 27, 1998 Motion to Strike the Reply filed by American Airlines, Inc. ("American") in the above-captioned proceeding. Without addressing the merits of the important competitive issues raised by Aeromexico concerning the joint application of American and Linea Aerea Nacional Chile ("Lan Chile"), American has opted to file a Motion to Strike the Reply ("Motion"). Aeromexico respectfully submits that its Reply regarding the comments filed on the American/Lan Chile application was properly filed in accordance with the Department of Transportation's ("Department") regulations, and that American's hyperbolic and legally unsupported Motion should be denied!"

^{1/} If the Department concludes that Aeromexico's Reply was improperly filed, it respectfully requests that the Department treat this document as a Motion for Leave to Late-File (continued...)

In attempting to strike Aeromexico's Reply, American bears the burden of proving that the Reply was "not in substantial conformity with the applicable rules or regulations of DOT." 14 C.F.R. § 302.5 (1997). As the following discussion reveals, however, American's Motion is insufficient to meet this exacting standard.

American's Motion consists of two, equally unavailing arguments. First, American contends that because Aeromexico is a "carrier of Mexico," it lacks the necessary standing to file a response to the American/Lan Chile application. Motion at 3.² American also alleges that, even if Aeromexico possessed standing to file a response, its Reply should still be stricken because it is not a true reply, but instead an "untimely objection." Motion at 2. American offers no legal or factual support for either of these assertions — because there is none. For this reason, both of these assertions are easily dispensed with below.

American's attempt to strike Aeromexico's Reply on the grounds that it lacks standing is founded on a mischaracterization of important procedural and substantive issues. As American is

 $[\]underline{1}/(\dots \text{ continued})$

Comments to the American/Lan Chile Application for Antitrust Immunity. Good cause exists for accepting as Comments the Reply previously filed by Aeromexico because Aeromexico reasonably believed that its Reply conformed with Order 98-2-21 (February 20, 1998) and the relevant Department of Transportation Regulations (14 C.F.R. §§ 302 and 303). Moreover, acceptance of this filing will not prejudice any party or unduly delay this proceeding.

^{2/} American's suggestion that Aeromexico is disqualified from participating in this proceeding because it is "a carrier of Mexico" and not a U.S. carrier is especially distasteful in light of American's stem reprimand of United for its comments that Lan Chile was "selling-out" to American. Joint Reply of American and Lan Chile, (OST-97-3285), March 24, 1998, at 28. American classified United's remarks as "condescending" and "xenophobic," terms which apply to American's present denigration of Aeromexico's basis for participation in this proceeding.

surely aware, Department Order 98-2-21 (February 20, 1998) ("Order") provides that comments and replies to the American/Ian Chile application may be filed with the Department by "interested parties." See Order at 4. By claiming that Aeromexico lacked standing to file its Reply, American is in fact claiming that Aeromexico does not qualify as an "interested party" to these proceedings.

The proposition that Aeromexico lacks standing to respond to the American/Ian Chile application has no basis in fact or law. In reality, the term "interested party" as it is used in this context is intended to include Iall particls that are indepented inhthere proceedings I e v a n t portion of the Department's Regulations makes it clear that the term "interested party" means "any person." See 14 C.F.R. §§ 303.41 and 303.42 (1997). Thus the universe of interested parties does not exclude "third-country carriers" such as Aeromexico, but includes any party that has an interest in the proceedings and chooses to file a submission. In the case of Aeromexico, its strong interest in the competitive (or, more precisely, anti-competitive) implications of the proposed American/Ian Chile alliance are clearly spelled out in its Reply. See Reply at 3-4. Aeromexico was therefore conferred standing to file its Reply by the Department's Order inviting responses from "interested parties."

American's remaining argument is that Aeromexico's Reply should still be stricken because it is not really a reply but is actually an "untimely objection." Motion at 2. As support, American cites Order 98-2-2 1, which, by American's characterization, "required objections on March 13, 1998, and replies on March 24, 1998." Motion at 1. Three "timely objections" were then filed by Delta, United and Continental. *Id.* at 1-2. From there, American concludes that by filing comments critical

of the application on March 24, 1998, Aeromexico's Reply was nothing more than a disguised objection, untimely filed.

American relies on a factual distortion in an effort to support its position. The truth is that Order 98-2-21 directed interested parties to file "comments" by March 13 and "replies" by March 24. See Order at 4. Delta, United and Continental therefore filed timely comments on the application in consideration, and Aeromexico, the Regional Business Partnership (Newark), and American and Lan Chile filed timely replies to those comments. The fact that all three comments express opposition to the proposed alliance, however, did not, as American suggests, dictate that Aeromexico's critical Reply also had to be filed during the comment stage. Moreover, by moving to strike only the reply of Aeromexico, and not the similarly critical reply of the Regional Business Partnership (Newark), American appears to be applying a duel set of standards which should not be countenanced by the Department.

Indeed, Aeromexico's motivation for opting to file a reply, rather than a comment, is clearly communicated in the Reply itself Aeromexico plainly states that while it agreed with many of the points raised by Delta, United and Continental in their comments, it was concerned that certain issues of vital interest to Aeromexico and U.S. travelers had not been sufficiently discussed. Reply at 1-2. Aeromexico's Reply was thus designed to bring to the Department's attention "the very important considerations associated with the effects of the proposed alliance on the Latin American regional market," such as the competitive impact of the proposed alliance for U.S. travelers flying to and throughout the Latin American region which were not comprehensively addressed by any of the

comments of Delta, United, or Continental. Reply at 2. Consequently, Aeromexico's properly filed Reply provides a unique and important perspective to these proceedings that must be considered by the Department.

In light of the foregoing reasons, Aeromexico respectfully urges the Department to deny American's Motion and entertain Aeromexico's properly filed Reply. In the alternative, Aeromexico requests that the Department treat this document as a Motion for Leave to Late-File Comments to the American/Lan-Chile application for Antitrust Immunity.

Respectfully submitted,

Irwin P. Altschuler, Esq.

Donald S. Stein, Esq.

Stephanie E. Silverman, Senior Advisor

John W. Vardaman, III, Esq.

Manatt, Phelps & Phillips

1501 M Street, N.W., Suite 700

Washington, DC 20005

202-463-4300

April 3, 1998

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Department of Transportation Docket No. OST-97-3285

I, Donald S. Stein, hereby **certify** that a copy of the Opposition To The Motion of American Airlines, Inc. to Strike the Reply of Aerovias de Mexico, S.A. de D.V., in response to Order No. 98-2-21 have been sent by first class U.S. mail, certified, return receipt requested, postage prepaid, this 3rd day of April, 1998 to the following parties:

Shelley A. Longmuir Vice President - Government Affairs United Air Lines, Inc. 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW **Suite** 1210 Washington, DC 20036

Corporate Affairs US Airways Crystal Park Four 2345 Crystal Drive Arlington, VA 22227

Joel S. Spiro Deputy Assistant Secretary for Transportation Department of State 220 1 C Street, N.W. Room 5830 Washington, DC 20520

Allan W. Markham Arrow Air, Inc. 2733 36th Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20007- 1422

Michael F. Goldman Bagileo, Silverberg & Goldman 1101 30th Street, N.W. Suite 120 Washington, DC 20007

Bruce Keiner, Jr. Continental Airlines Emery Worldwide Crowell & Morning 100 1 Pennsylvania Avenue N. W. Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20004

Lawrence M. Nagin

Executive Vice President,

Joel S. Burton United Air Lines, Inc. Ginsburg, Feldman & Bress, Chartered 1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036

Robert E. Cohn Delta Air Lines, Inc. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge 2300 N Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20037 Elliott M. Seiden Vice President, Law and Government **Affairs** Northwest Airlines, Inc. 901 15th Street, N.W. Suite 301 Washington, DC 20005

Glenn Albus
Legal Department
Evergreen International
Aviation, Inc.
3850 Three Mile Lane
McMinnville, OR 97 128

R. Tenney Johnson **DHL** Airways 2300 N Street, N.W. Suite 600 Washington, DC 20037

James W. Tello Miami Air International Filler, Weller & Tello, P. C. 117 N. Henry Street Alexandria, VA 223 14-0784

William H. Callaway
Challenge Air Cargo
Zuckert, Scoutt & Rasenberger
888 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

David L. Vaughan United Parcel Service Kelley, Drye & Warren 1200 19th Street, N.W. Suite 500 Washington, DC 20036 Marshall S. Sinick
Squire, Sanders &
Dempsey, L.L.P.
120 1 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20004

Pierre Murphy Southern Air Transport 2445 M Street, N.W. Suite 260 Washington, DC 20037

Roger W. Fones Antitrust Division Department of Justice 325 7th Street, N.W. Suite 500 Washington, DC 20530

Nathaniel P. Breed, Jr. Federal Express, Inc. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge 2300 N Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20037

Aaron Goerlich Carnival Air Lines Boros & Garfalo, P.C. 120 1 Connecticut Avenue Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036

Peter Reaveley
Dade County Aviation Dept.
Miami International Airport
P.O. Box 592075
Miami, FL 33159

John L. Richardson Amerijet International Seeger, Potter, Richardson, Luxton, **Joselow &** Brooks 2121 **K** Street, N.W Suite 700 Washington, DC 20037

Suzette Matthews Million Air Bernstein & Matthews 4649 John Barton Payne Road Marshall, VA 20 115-2529

Alfred J. Eichenlaub Polar Air Cargo Ginsburg, Feldman & Bress, Chartered 1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036

Arnold J. Grossman Vice President - International Affairs American Airlines, Inc. P.O. Box 619616, MD 5635 DFW Airport, TX 75261

Richard P. Taylor **Steptoe &** Johnson, LLP 1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington DC 20036

Stephen L. **Gelband**Hews, Morella & **Gelband**1000 Potomac Street, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007

Director of Aviation Port Authority of New York and New Jersey One Wold Trade Center 65N New York, NY 10048

Richard J. Fahy, Jr. Consulting Attorney Trans World Airlines, Inc. 900 19th Street, N.W. Suite 350 Washington, DC 20006

Gerard J. Arpey
Senior Vice President - Finance and Planning
and Chief Financial Officer
American Airlines, Inc.
P.O. Box 61916, MD 5621
DFW Airport, TX 75261

David A. **Schwarte**Managing Director, International **Affairs**American Airlines, Inc.
P.O. Box 619616, MD 5635
DFW Airport, TX 75261

Charles J. Simpson, Jr.
Zuckert, **Scoutt &** Rasenberger, LLP
888 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006

Samuel Crane, President Regional Business Partnership (Newark) One Newark Center Newark, NJ 07102

and by hand delivery, this 3rd of April, 1998 upon the following parties:

William K. Ris, Jr.
Vice President - Government Affairs
American Airlines, Inc.
1101 17th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036

D. Scott Yohe
Senior Vice President,
Government Affairs
Delta Air Lines, Inc.
1275 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Carl B. Nelson, Jr. Associate General Counsel American Airlines, Inc. 1101 17th Street, N.W. Suite 600 Washington, DC 20036

Donald S. Stein

Manatt, Phelps & Phillips 1501 M Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-1702 (202) 463-4300

S:\AEROMEX\CERTIFIC.SVC\040398\1433